

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/658,824	09/08/2003	Stephen I. Rennard	UNMC/03017/0008	7805	
. 75			EXAMINER		
Moser, Patterson & Sheridan, LLP			AFREMOVA, VERA		
Suite 1500			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
3040 Post Oak I	· · · · · · ·		ARTONII	TAFER NUMBER	
Houston, TX 77056-6582		1651			
			DATE MAILED: 09/13/2006	5	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Advisory Action						
Before	the	Filing	of a	n Ap	peal	Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)		
10/658,824	RENNARD ET AL.		
Examiner	Art Unit		
Vera Afremova	1651		

Advisory Action	10/030,024	KLINIAKO ET AL.	· ·			
Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief	Examiner	Art Unit				
	Vera Afremova	1651				
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence add	ress			
THE REPLY FILED 21 July 2006 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APP	THE REPLY FILED 21 July 2006 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.					
 The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or or this application, applicant must timely file one of the follow places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notal Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliant time periods: The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date 	wing replies: (1) an amendment, aft otice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in one with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply more	idavit, or other evider compliance with 37 C	nce, which FR 41.31; or (3)			
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire	Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth later than SIX MONTHS from the mailin	g date of the final rejecti	on.			
Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 7	06.07(f).					
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of ex under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office late may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b) NOTICE OF APPEAL	tension and the corresponding amount shortened statutory period for reply orig r than three months after the mailing da	of the fee. The appropr inally set in the final Offi	iate extension fee ce action; or (2) as			
 The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exter a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed AMENDMENTS 	ension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of th				
3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection,			ecause			
 (a) They raise new issues that would require further co (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below 		TE below);				
(c) They are not deemed to place the application in be appeal; and/or		ducing or simplifying	the issues for			
(d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).		ected claims.				
 4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.1 5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s) 		mpliant Amendment	(PTOL-324).			
 Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be a non-allowable claim(s). 	llowable if submitted in a separate,	timely filed amendme	ent canceling the			
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is pro The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed: <u>none</u> . Claim(s) objected to: <u>none</u> .		ll be entered and an e	explanation of			
Claim(s) rejected: <u>11-19</u> . Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: <u>none</u> .						
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE						
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, be because applicant failed to provide a showing of good an was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). 	ut before or on the date of filing a N id sufficient reasons why the affidat	otice of Appeal will <u>no</u> /it or other evidence i	ot be entered s s necessary and			
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessar	overcome <u>all</u> rejections under appe y and was not earlier presented. S	al and/or appellant fa see 37 CFR 41.33(d)(ils to provide a 1).			
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER	on of the status of the claims after e	ntry is below or attacl	ned.			
11. The request for reconsideration has been considered by see attached.			nce because:			
12. ☑ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). 13. ☐ Other:	(PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s). <u>2/21/06</u>	and 1/05/04				

Application/Control Number: 10/658,824

Art Unit: 1651

Attachment to Advisory Action

Applicants arguments filed 7/21/2006 have been fully considered but not found persuasive because they are mostly directed to the same issues discussed in the last office action.

Therefore, claims 11-19 remain rejected as explained in the prior office action.

Main applicants' argument is directed to the teaching by the cited patent US 2003/0119107 (Dang et al). Applicants appear to argue (page 5, par. 2-3) that Dang et al. teach away by stating that a matrix "does not interfere with the growth and differentiation of EBs" and, thus, the matrix does not "influence differentiation or growth of EBs in any manner" (paragraph 168). Upon review this is not found persuasive because differentiation is influenced by a culture medium supplemented with cytokines and/or growth factor but not by the matrix providing for support or for "scaffold" within the meaning of the claimed invention. Thus, the matrix does not "influence differentiation" in the cited method within the meaning the claims.

Information Disclosure Statement

The missing copies of the references 3 and 4 (IDS filed 1/05/2004) were not provided.

Therefore, the information disclosure statement filed 1/05/2004 fails to comply with 37 CFR

1.98(a)(2), which requires a legible copy of each cited foreign patent document; each non-patent literature publication or that portion which caused it to be listed; and all other information or that portion which caused it to be listed. Thus, the references 3 and 4 were not considered in the absence of the copies of that portion which caused it to be listed on IDS filed 1/05/2004.

Art Unit: 1651

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Vera Afremova whose telephone number is (571) 272-0914. The examiner can normally be reached from Monday to Friday from 9.30 am to 6.00 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Michael Wityshyn can be reached at (571) 272-0926.

The fax phone number for the TC 1600 where this application or proceeding is assigned is (571) 273-8300.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Technology center 1600, telephone number is (571) 272-1600.

Vera Afremova

AU 1651

September 8, 2006

VERA AFREMOVA

V. Ifn

PRIMARY EXAMINER